TURIC
MEETING REPORT
AUGUST 21, 2002

1. Introduction
Janet Pence (janet.pence@customs.treas.gov) explained the role of the TURIC. The
TURIC serves as the governing body for TSN, sets guidelines for full TSN source
committees and addresses and resolves conflicts within the TSN.

TSN membership rules were also discussed:
- Trade members must submit an application for TSN membership
- Members must attend 2 out of 3 yearly TSN Plenary Sessions, otherwise
  Customs will send a letter.
- Membership categories by trade sector (brokers, importers, exporters, freight
  forwarders, carriers) exist to balance membership. Waiting lists may exist.
  Customs may also do marketing to recruit additional members where needed,
  e.g. to recruit additional carriers if a void exists.
- The TURIC agreed to allow outsiders to participate temporarily as "advisors"
  in Committee meetings. Such "advisors" wouldn't be allowed at TSN
  meetings. Need to ensure that for Committee meetings during TSN plenary
  sessions that there aren't more people than hotel capacity allows. The decision
  was made for the October 8-10 Plenary Session that non-TSN members would
  not be allowed Committee meetings.
- Committee membership will be determined by the Chairs including accepting
  cross-Committee members and rejecting new members. Members may serve
  on more than one committee if agreed to by the Chairs. However, for purposes
  of the TSN Plenary sessions they must chose one primary committee.

Janet Pence will revise and disseminate the ground rules, and she asked the Co-chairs to
keep active committee lists.

2. Update on Account Management and Truck Release
    John Osborn, Dan Mariottini, Tom Vassar

Question: What is meant by a static HTS?
Answer: The trade will be able to view the HTS through the portal, but it will not be live
data.

Question: Will the HTS update message be through the portal and will the HTS be
updated? This is a major concern because timeliness of HTS updates is critical for the
trade. If the HTS is not updated immediately, then there is no functionality in what is
being delivered. It could be damaging to the trade if they used the incorrect HTS
information.

Answer: The HTS will not be refreshed from October 2002 until February 2003. Once the HTS is available to the trade, it will be kept current. It was also pointed out that it is critical for the HTS on ACE and the HTS on ACS to stay in synch. HTS data must be accurate and up to date for all account portal users.

Question: In October 2002, will the account managers have access to account data?
Answer: No, they will not. That information will be available in February 2003.

Question: In January 2003, will the eCP have the 2003 HTS?
Answer: Yes
Susan Maskell (susan.c.maskell@customs.treas.gov) added that the client representatives needed to be added to the group of Customs employees who would have access in October 2002. They needed to become familiar with the portal and the functionality to be able to support the trade in February.

Question: What type of user testing will take place?
Answer: Among other things, there will be systems integration testing, site testing, followed by a pilot period to determine operational readiness.

Question: Will HTS functionality be expanded to include explanatory notes and rulings?
Answer: Yes

Question: When the portal is available, will the trade have access to the HTS?
Answer: Yes

Question: Will results of the pilot be shared?
Answer: Yes

Dan Mariottini asked the importers who had applied for portal access how many account users they would have. The eCP was estimating 50 users per company for licensing purposes. Lori Goldberg estimated General Electric would have approximately 50 internal users, not including 3rd party users. General Motors felt they would have 50 users depending on the functionality provided.

The trade is looking for the ability to review data through the portal as well as make management decisions. The account users at the operational level would be basically accessing transactional data.

The trade asked what data elements will be available through the portal; what functions will be available and what queries can be run? The answer will determine how useful the data will be, and how many users will be needed.

Question: Will there be roles and responsibilities with relationships?
Answer: The portal, through CRM, can accommodate that.

*Question***: Will there be business partner relationships with carriers and brokers?**

Answer: **It is all business partner relationships.**

Question: Has anyone estimated the amount of time it is going to take to set up the account?
Answer: The eCP is researching the complexity of the build out.

Question: Does the eCP need OMB approval for filling the portal with the account data?
Answer: Janet Pence (janet.pence@customs.treas.gov) volunteered to look into this issue.

Question: When will Customs notify importers of their selection so that they can start on the pre-work to collect the information they will need to set up their account?
Answer: Customs is targeting September 2002 for the notification. The eCP is also looking into bringing the selected importers in for a workshop in late September or October.

Question: Will ACE be able to accept batch updates from brokers to set up accounts? Some importers will want their brokers to set up account for them with Customs.
Answer: In the future, this capability will be available, but not in February 2003. There are requirements to allow for batch updates.

Question: Who will be responsible for account maintenance? Is it the account themselves or Customs?
Answer: It is the account owner's responsibility to ensure the account information is properly maintained. ACE does provide the capability for the trade to update their account information. All accounts should have an Account Administrator who will be responsible for controlling access to the owners account, restricting access to data, etc.

Art Litman added that brokers may also maintain account information for their clients. Customs needs to establish rules for account maintenance.

Ken Bargteil expressed concern about the make up of the TSN and the fact that importers are not as homogeneous as the ones attending the TSN meetings. The initial 40 accounts will likely not be a representative random sample of importers.   He is also concerned about the level of complexity to establish an account with a portal view. Some brokers have already established profile relationships for their clients and can provide that service in the future as interest grows. Tom Anastasi added that since the first release is primarily for large importers, maintenance may be difficult. Sandra Scott also expressed concern about carrier account issues.

Question: Will the periodic statement be developed using a COTS package?
Answer: Yes, but it will not look like a visa statement in the initial periodic statement delivery. There will be limitations based on linkage to ACS. Revenue functionality will grow with ACE.

Jim Phillips stated that the Revenue Committee was planning to form a Payment Structure Subcommittee, but is awaiting design workshops with the eCP. It was noted that the eCP will work with the Revenue Committee to develop full payment functionality. Payment workshops should be set up in about 1 ½ months. Dan Mariottini will provide a calendar for revenue (and all 1.2) workshops in a couple of weeks.

Question: How will ACE handle scanable documents? Will they just scan the documents or will the scanned documents actually be read into ACE? This is an issue that should be worked with the Transition Committee.

Answer: Tom Anastasi recommended that 3461 ALT be added to the e-release slide in addition to the 3461 and 7501 shown. This will allay the border brokers' concerns. The recommended changes will be made.

Len Podgurny re-enforced the trade's positions that they like the current C-4 code process because it expedites release.

Question: Can C-TPAT and non-C-TPAT shipments be in the same container? Under the FAST FRN, the trade cannot mix shipments.
Answer: This is a Customs policy call. It is not a systems issue.

Tom Anastasi: If the carrier is filing an electronic manifest with Customs, then PAPS could also be considered e-release.

Question: Is the eCP working with Canada on transponder issues?
Answer: Yes.

Steve Graham and Len Podgurny both stressed the need for adequate lead time for the trade to prepare for an automated truck manifest. The MMM Committee has requested one year lead time both for budgeting and programming.

Question: Will the trade receive on line shipment status notifications from FDA and AG through ACE?
Answer: That functionality will initially remain in ACS. Only FMCSA will be involved in I1 R2. Other PGAs will follow in future Increments and their information will be added to ACE.

Question: Will X12 queries be replied to with X12 messages?
Answer: The eCP is looking at using the rail AMS architecture as the model.

Question: How will Instruments of International Trade be handled?
Answer: We will take that as an action item and get back to you.

Question: Will the carriers and brokers have full portal functionality like the importers will?

Answer: Full scope of broker/carrier portal functionality will be in Increment 2. The eCP recognizes that a portal solution **for carriers and brokers?** must be delivered in 1.2 to support functionality.

Question: Will 321 capabilities be projected to the air and ocean environment?
Answer: It is a requirement in Increment 2.

Question: Why can't the carrier file the 321 instead of the broker/importer?
Answer: Current regulations state that the importer must decide if 321 applies. The truck cannot close the LTL manifest without the 321. Sandra Scott pointed out that often the carriers do not know about the 321.

Tom Anastasi stated that a vessel shipment entering Montreal which is transferred to a truck to enter the US is not a multi-modal shipment. It is merely a truck shipment from Canada. Adi Abel added that the MMM Committee was proposing that the carrier transmit American loads to Customs and that the truck carrier would then just have to identify the shipment. Tom Anastasi stated this would cause reconciliation issues. There is also a legal issue involved. Janet Pence will talk to John Considine about this issue.

Question: What about Multimodes for split shipments that MMM submitted? It does not appear to be provided for.
Answer: That is a policy issue which Customs needs to address. It has been referred to the Legal/Policy Committee.

Question: Are the 9 FAST data elements available yet? When will the trade be notified?
Answer: They will be made available as soon as they are finalized.

Question: How much in advance would the carrier and driver need to be pre-registered?
Answer: Susan Maskell (susan.c.maskell@customs.treas.gov) replied for NCAP/P the time period is currently seven days.

Question: Why is BRASS standard e-release and not preferred?
Answer: If pre-filed manifest with electronic C4 code then it would be preferred. Dan Buchanan questioned why the trade would do BRASS if they were C-TPAT and approved for FAST. If the carrier and the importer are both C-TPAT, you do not need the C4 code. This issue will be discussed further off line.

Art Litman felt the TSN Tracking Template was not useful for 1.1. He asked if it could be provided for 1.2. Janet Pence (janet.pence@customs.treas.gov) asked the trade to review the first column of the tracking template to see if it covered all of the information they thought they would need in the future. The Tracking Template was developed in response to the trade's request at the June 2002 TSN to give them information on the hardware/software, cost and functional requirements to implement ACE. Janet Pence also said that eCP would look at the template to see if they could revise it to reflect more relevant and useful information for October 2002. The trade was asked to provide comments on the template within three weeks. Comments should reflect what the trade

would like to see included in the TSN Tracking Template to make it more useful for their planning purposes. Comments should be sent to Susan Maskell (susan.c.maskell@customs.treas.gov).

Question: Is anyone working with Mexico on transponder standards?
Answer: There is a multi agency group addressing transponder standards.

Question: Is there a template which tracks overall data migration? A data migration model with a roll out chart would be useful.
Answer: This was taken as an action item.

3. TSN Requirements Update: Don Harmon
A report from the User Requirement Tracking Matrix (URTM) was presented that tracks TSN user requirements to increments.   Janet Pence (janet.pence@customs.treas.gov) asked that Committees review the mapping matrix and provide comments. Susan Maskell (susan.c.maskell@customs.treas.gov) will send the matrix electronically to TURIC members. Comments from the trade should be sent to Anita Brown (abrown@strtrade.com) and Frank Korpusik (fkorpusik@strtrade.com). Once comments are received and incorporated, the report will be posted to the website.

The issue of transactions accepted through the portal was discussed. There is both opposition and support on this issue. It was noted that the Government is already supporting webbased submission of data through AES direct. Len Podgurny has the lead to hold a discussion with the Transition Committee to outline the differences and commonalities on this issue. Customs will also vet this issue through Chief Counsel. Custom has final decision authority on this issue.

4. Trade Participation in Portal Design: Lori Goldberg
The focus of the workshop was Increment 1 Release 1 (February 2003), with the goal being the design of the portal structure to deliver what would be useful to both the trade and Customs.

Question: Should Customs provide the mechanism to be able to do corrections through the portal?
Answer: There are really two types of corrections: reconciliation and other types of revisions. The workshop participants were not interested in filing reconciliations through the portal. They expressed an interest, however, in being able to make transactional changes through the portal. This topic is a subset of the issue on accepting transactions through the portal, and has been identified for further discussion.

The Entry Committee has formed a Reconciliation/Amendment Subcommittee, which will also be addressing this issue. Technology wise, this is not a big issue. There was concern, however, expressed that this proposal could go around the licensed broker process.   The changes could involve duty changes which is no small issue.

Question: When will details on design requirements be available, such as, the ACE ID? The trade does not want it to be the same as the IRS #.
Answer: The ACE ID will be a system generated ID. The trade and Customs still need to decide what that account number will be and if it will be used for transactions. Bob Hamilton explained, from a revenue perspective IRS number is important. It is required by law for other PGA reporting (whenever a debt or receivable is generated).

Question: What is the liability for the inadvertent release of data in the Customs system?
Answer: This issue has been referred to the Legal Policy Committee.

The following recommendations were made for future design workshops to make them more beneficial to the trade:
- Provide process maps and flow charts at the beginning
- Provide a list of proposed data elements for the trade to review

5. Legal Policy Update: John Peterson

John Peterson gave a brief history of how the TSN Legal/Policy Committee was established.
A brief synopsis was given on the issues that have been discussed thus far by the Committee. These issues included:
1) Payment of Duties and Fees
   §383 of the Trade Act of 2002 imposes the payment of duties/fees within a 10 day period- this eliminates the flexibility currently given for "snow days." This language was driven by Bill Thomson and does not have support from either Customs or the trade. John Kent and Harvey Isaacs are working on language to try and remedy this situation.
2) Protest Subcommittee
   Chief Counsel was tasked with drafting some language addressing the protest process. One of the things that was agreed upon was the rolling up §1520(c) elements into §1514. After review of that language, the trade asked for clearer language setting forth that trade can protest any type of liquidation – whether by action, inaction or decision. Harvey Isaascs and John Kent volunteered to revise the proposed language submitted by Chief Counsel to clarify this point. This revised language should be distributed to the TSN Legal/Policy Committee sometime before the end of this week.
3) IASS
   Due to difficulties that would arise in liquidating the entire IASS, language has been drafted which speaks to liquidating the "reconfigured lines" (i.e., reconfigured entries) on the IASS.
4) Draft Bill
   Jeff Laxague mentioned that there is a Draft Bill that Customs has signed off on, and that if we are lucky, we will be successful in getting that language passed before Congress goes home.
5) Referral Forms
   Specific forms have been developed for the following:

a) Committee Referral- Committee refers issues having potential statutory/regulatory impact to the TSN Legal/Policy Committee
b) TSN Legal/Policy Committee Reply- response sent back from TSN Legal/Policy Committee to initiating TSN Committee

Question: Are there any legal/policy issues being addressed by the Legal/Policy Committee relating to the southern border (e.g., who is going to be transmitting manifest?)?
Answer: The TSN Legal/Policy Committee has discussed issues that have been forwarded to it by other TSN Committees, and items that need to be fixed in legislation so that ACE can be programmed.
The TSN Legal/Policy Committee does not initiate policy per se, but acts upon recommendations as per the other Committees.
The present discussions in the TSN Legal/Policy Committee have focused on non-controversial issues (i.e., trade and Customs have common position) that can be easily addressed in upcoming legislation.
However, this issue has also been raised by the MultiModal Manifest Committee and submitted for Customs review.

Question: Can the trade see a summary of all of the identified legal/policy issues?
Answer: The legal/policy tracking matrix is still under review. It will be distributed to the trade pursuant to the end of that review process.

6. Product Identification Code Proposal: Govind Jagannathan
This is a concept the eCP has proposed to US Customs including Participating Government Agencies (PGAs). In turn, PGAs and Customs requested the concept be presented to the Trade to gather their input.   The proposal consists of creating a database that would accept a common ID for each product imported into the United States. This common ID would be the UPC code which is used for 99% of products throughout the supply chain. The UPC code (or if unavailable, the manufacturer's catalog code) would be registered in the database including its relationship to other government classifications and codes, for example, to HTS number and/or FDA codes.

The information on the UPC code is static. The idea is for importers and brokers that transact with that product/code to get the information from the database, including applicable HTS number and other US government agency codes. There is also the potential for manufacturers to input information directly into the database.   So importers/brokers would supply the code only (UPC or manufacturer's catalog) for all their transactions and the system (purportedly ACE) would automatically associate the code to the HTS and pertinent agencies' code.

The project is on stand-by until Govind gets input from all interested parties.

Note: the answers were provided by Govind. However, some are government policy decisions that require further consultation and agreement from Customs and PGAs.

Question: Is this public information? If you're a new importer, can you look up the UPC code and see what the classification is?
Answer: It can be either a government database or private database.
Registration of the UPC would be voluntary and the registrant would agree to allow other members of the trade to view UPC information.

Some members of the Trade stated that this may be a confidentiality issue for some companies whose UPC code information may be too detailed. They wouldn't want this to be available to potential competitors. This would require investment on the part of the registrant so it would create a competitive disadvantage between competitors particularly by the one that did all the research to do come up with classifications, etc. Perhaps this would work in situations where there is one manufacturer and many importers, and the manufacturer would pay for the classification, for example.

Question: Is the UPC code used worldwide?
Answer: UPC is only a US standard. However, the EAN (European Article Number) is targeted to be harmonized with the UPC by 2005 to have a universal number. This could be used throughout the world that would be applicable to both import and export transactions.

Question: Are UPC codes used by other than consumer products such as intermediary merchandise?
Answer: Most intermediary products are covered. The ones that are not covered are, for example, produce, textiles, and bearings. However, the trade uses instead manufacturers catalog codes to identify these products.

Question: What are the commercial implications for large shipments of retail chains, for example? Who would be doing the input of all the UPC codes for products imported on behalf of Wal-Mart, for example?
Answer: It's up to the importer, company owner of UPC to designate who would do the input.

Question: What are the legal implications? Who is Customs going to hold responsible for reasonable care?
Answer: Govind indicated that according to Chief Counsel Customs would be responsible for determining if there is a classification conflict, for example, between two different companies. It would depend on whether there are rulings involved, import specialists reviews of the merchandise, etc. It is the responsibility of the importer to verify information. The database could contain a color coordinated system for designating status of product code according to level of Customs review.

Question: What about Customs verification? Will Customs have the ability to verify all the UPC codes?
Answer: Customs would randomly review the database to determine accuracy of information. Additionally, product codes would be designated explaining the level of verification and certification.

Question: How transparent what has been registered and approved by Participating Government Agencies (PGAs) will be to the Trade?
Answer: It would be very transparent. There would be a product color code, for example, explaining the level of registration, verification and certification.

Question: Does the Trade see a value in this database, would the Trade use it?
Answer: Some in the trade see a benefit to being able to obtain all necessary information related to a UPC code. Brokers, for example, sometimes have a hard time obtaining detailed information about a specific product for classification and code determinations. The database would also be practical since it would eliminate repetition-having to key in the same information repetitively.
Govind asked TURIC members to send emails with comments on the idea. He is particularly interested in finding out if the Trade would use the system.

Question: What about carriers using the UPC code in the manifest in lieu of the commodity description?
Answer: This is definitely a potential use of the product code that should be considered.

Question: Who in Customs reviewed this proposal?
Answer: Representatives from Customs Office of Field Operations, Office of Regulations and Ruling, Office of Investigations and Chief Counsel in addition to the Customs Modernization Office. There was a meeting that took place at Customs on June 7, 2002. Customs sees the benefit in getting more information from the Trade.

However, Millie Gleason (millie.m.gleason@customs.treas.gov) from the Office of Field Operations voiced her concerns with the proposal. She stated that classification is the responsibility of the Trade not Customs. She will speak with others within Customs to discuss this issue.

Question: Who will maintain the UPC database? This is an ever changing system of codes with many codes becoming outdated very quickly. Would Customs be required to maintain it? This would require substantial staffing and funding commitment for Customs.
Answer: For now it is expected that the Trade would be responsible for updating information they registered.

7. Update on FAST (Fast and Secure Trade): Susan Maskell
(susan.c.maskell@customs.treas.gov**)**
Canadian and U.S. Customs are participating in this initiative, with both countries' Customs and Immigration agencies. The National Customs Automation Program Prototype (NCAP/P) is being leveraged for FAST.
Elements being added to the current NCAP/P include driver registration and the requirement for carriers to be C-TPAT participants. A letter passes from Canadian

Customs to USCS patterned off the C-TPAT info; corporate structure, driver information. Volume is not a requirement.

Driver registration will be similar to the global enrollment system at the Northern Border. This will be submitted to Canadian Customs and then given to USCS for processing. And USCS will run queries on person. Then they will be issued a "calling" letter. This person will be interviewed, fingerprinted and IDd. They will be given a card with a chip that will be read once the truck approaches the border. Importers must be pre-approved, and must be participating in C-TPAT. The manifest must be submitted electronically.

The roll-out is scheduled for November 2002 at Buffalo, Blaine, Champlain, Port Huron and Detroit. A Federal Register notice will be issued in late September 2002 announcing FAST and opening it up to importers not currently participating in NCAP/P. Current NCAP/P will be grandfathered as long as they meet the driver registration requirements. The driver ID is supposed to work both ways. Canada will have the same technology.

Every effort will be made to have transponders in place for the beginning of the program for conveyance ID, but if not available a bar code would be acceptable.
The data elements requested in the U.S. will most likely not converge with Canadian requested (CSA) elements.
According to Sandra Scott, the importer has to be CSA to participate in FAST.
PIP (Partners in Protection) is the equivalent to C-TPAT

8. Committee Presentations:

Transition:
The Transition Committee will be focusing on Automated Commercial System (ACS) to the Automated Commercial Environment (ACE) issues and concerns. They will also be focusing on culture changes; such as assisting in communications to outside users, and assisting in planning computer based training. The Cross-Committee form, which was developed to identify cross-committee issues, should be sent to the eCP Trade Lead first who will coordinate with the other Committee(s).

The TSN Committees were asked to review the issues being discussed in the purview of their meetings and determine if there are any issues that may impact transition.
These issues should be identified through the Cross-Committee Referral form and submitted to the Transition Committee.

MMM:
Len's main point related to explaining the importance of getting detailed design descriptions of what carriers will need to do to implement ACE. This is required a year in advance of deployment. If carriers don't get this information by this October 2002, they will be unable to make a case with their upper management to obtain company funding to program new systems. This could mean very little or no carrier participation in the first transactional deployment of ACE.

Len asked that other Committees inform him of any discussions relating to manifest issues. He didn't identify legal policy issues with other committees because they thought they had been resolved. Additionally, his Committee is waiting for a Customs reply to the list of legal issues that was submitted to the Legal/Policy Committee.

MMM has identified issues with other committees such as ITDS. Len sent issues to Shari and eCP will work to set up conference calls to address these issues. MMM is coordinating with ITDS to set up conference call and with Transition to have a separate conference call on the using the Portal for submission of transaction data.

Revenue:
The Revenue Committee has formed an E-bond Subcommittee, which is working to define the process for the various business partners. The Committee will also be forming a Drawback Subcommittee made up of members from the Export and Entry Committees as well as the Revenue Committee. Art Litman recommended first that the new Subcommittee seek guidance from Customs on whether they are willing to consider redesigning the entire drawback process or just redoing the current process. Betsy Durant has stated that it's not premature for the trade to be capturing drawback requirements. The Drawback Subcommittee will work closely with the TSN Legal/Policy Committee.

The Revenue Committee is awaiting input from the eCP on design sessions for the 1.2 periodic payment.

With respect to the pending legislation on periodic payment in the Homeland Security Bill, the Revenue Committee is working to amend the current language which was passed in the House. This effort is also aiming at amending the periodic payment language passed in the Trade Bill.

Question: Are carriers included on the E-bond Subcommittee?
Answer: The Subcommittee contains several surety representatives who also write the carrier bonds. Len Podgurny will check with the MMM Committee membership to see if anyone is interested in participating on the E-bond Subcommittee.

Entry:
The IASS is no longer being consider an entry summary for legal purposes. The new term as it applies to liquidating and extending an IASS is "reconfigured entry summary". This will allow each line on an IASS to be considered a reconfigured entry and thus subject to reconciliation, liquidation and extension. This proposal is supported by Customs and the trade.

MPF is still being discussed. The issue is whether it should be applied on releases or the IASS. Whatever is worked out, it must be revenue neutral.

The Entry Committee has formed a Reconciliation/Amendment Subcommittee to address reconciliation and other post-summary, pre-liquidation revisions.

Export:
The Export Committee has finalized its membership, and has conducted several committee meetings. User requirements are currently being developed by committee members based on major export functional areas identified in previous meetings. The primary focus is on incorporating AES functionality in ACE with necessary revisions and enhancements.

The present Trade Act and other legislation under consideration will have a significant impact on export user requirements. The Trade Act requirement that exporters present the SED or ITN for AES shipments for vessel shipments will negate the use of AES Option 3 and 4 filing options. Other legislation requiring the mandatory use of AES for CCL and USML shipments and for all exports is also being closely monitored by the export committee.

ITDS:
FMCSA is working on their requirements. This is the only agency that will for certain be on schedule for 1.2.   The Trade needs at least 10 months in advance from the Participating Government Agencies (PGAs).

FMCSA has other agencies within DOT with which they need to coordinate.

The majority of the PGAs with manifest are involved in Increment 2.

9.   Closeout

The **next TSN Plenary Session will be held on Oct 8-10 at the Hyatt Fair Lakes**. Agenda needs to be approved by the Deputy Commissioner, Browning.   Kathy Kormos (kathryn.c.kormos@customs.treas.gov) will disseminate a draft agenda to everyone. The agenda is pending approval from Deputy Commissioner Browning. Two full afternoons have been scheduled for committee meetings. Working lunches with keynote speakers will be an option, and if a TSN member elects to participate, payment must be made in advance. We are trying to keep cost of lunch to about $15 each. The meeting will last the three full days, so that Committee meetings can be accommodated.

Meeting Participants:

Michael Ford	BDP	Mford@bdpnet.com
John Peterson	C.H. Powell/NCBFAA	Jfpeterson@chpowell.com
Len Podgurny	Canadian National RR	Podgurny@cn.ca
Chuck Woods	Census	Charles.a.woods@census.gov
John J. Osborn	eCP	John.j.osborn@lmco.com
Shari McCann	eCP	Smccann@strtrade.com
Anita Brown	eCP	Abrown@strtrade.com
Frank Korpusik	eCP	Fkorpusik@strtrade.com
Don Harmon	eCP	Don.harmon@lmco.com
Sam Banks	eCP	Sbanks@strtrade.com
Cheryl Marin	eCP	Cynthia.c.marin@lmco.com
Bruce Brown	eCP	Bruce.a.brown@lmco.com
Adi Abel	eCP	Aabel@strtrade.com
Josephine Baiamonte	eCP	Jbaiamonte@strtrade.com
Frank Ojeda	eCP	Fojeda@kpmg.com
Jim Byram	eCP	James.h.byram@customs.treas.gov
Tom Vassar	eCP	Vassart@earthlink.net
Tom Anastasi	FedEx Trade Networks	Twanastasi@fedex.com
Art Litman	FedEx Trade Networks	Allitman@fedex.com
Lori Goldberg	General Electric	Lori.goldberg@corporate.ge.com
Jim Phillips	General Motors	Jim.phillips@gm.com
Kevin Smith	General Motors	k.smith@gm.com
Max Castillo	ITDS/FDA	m.castill@ora.fda.gov
Don Luther	KMZR/GETA	Don.luther@kmzr.com

Ken Bargteil	Kuehne & Nagel/NCBFAA	Ken.bargteil@kuehne-nagel.com
Steven Graham	Micro Software Services	Sgraham@editrade.com
Sandra Scott	Roadway Express	Sandra.scott@roadway.com
Don Yando	USCS	Donald.f.yando@customs.treas.com
Bob Hamilton	USCS	Robert.b.hamilton@customs.treas.com
Millie Gleason	USCS	Millie.m.gleason@customs.treas.gov
John Leonard	USCS	John.p.leonard@customs.treas.gov
Janet Pence	USCS	Janet.pence@customs.treas.gov
Susan Maskell	USCS	Susan.c.maskell@customs.treas.gov
Jeff Laxague	USCS	Jeffrey.j.laxague@customs.treas.gov
Michael C. Brown	USCS	Michael.c.brown@customs.treas.gov
Phyllis Rubenstein	USCS	Phyllis.rubenstein@customs.treas.gov
Dan Buchanan	USCS	Daniel.buchanan@customs.treas.gov
Kathy Kormos	USCS	Kathryn.c.kormos@customs.treas.gov
George Weise	Vastera	George.weise@vastera.com